```
KBJZZCONHRT
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
      -----x
     JAMES CONTANT, et al.,
 3
                    Plaintiffs,
 4
                v.
                                             17-CV-3139 (LGS)
5
     BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, et al.,
6
                                             Fairness Hearing
                    Defendants.
                                              (Via Teleconference)
 7
                                              November 19, 2020
                                              11:30 a.m.
 8
9
     Before:
10
                         HON. LORNA G. SCHOFIELD,
                                              District Judge
11
                               APPEARANCES
12
     BERGER MONTAGUE PC
13
          Attorneys for Plaintiffs
     BY: MICHAEL C. DELL'ANGELO
14
          MICHAEL J. KANE
          JOSHUA RIPLEY
15
     McCULLEY McCLUER PLLC
16
          Attorneys for Plaintiffs
     BY: STUART H. McCLUER
17
          R. BRYANT McCULLEY
          FRANK B. ULMER
18
     SCHNEIDER WALLACE COTTRELL KONECKY
19
          Attorneys for Plaintiffs
     BY: KYLE G. BATES
20
     PEIFFER WOLF CARR & KANE
21
          Attorneys for Plaintiffs
     BY: TRACEY COWAN
22
     BEUS GILBERT McGRODER, PLLC
23
          Attorneys for Plaintiffs
     BY: GARRETT W. WOTKYNS
24
25
```

```
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP (NY)
1
           Attorneys for Defendants BoA, Merrill Lynch
           RICHARD F. SCHWED
 2
      BY:
           ADAM S. HAKKI
 3
           JEFFREY J. RESETARITS
 4
      PAUL WEISS (NY)
           Attorneys for Defendant Bank of Tokyo, Mitsubishi UFJ Ltd.
           ANAND SITHIAN
5
      BY:
           ANDREW C. FINCH
           KENNETH A. GALLO
6
           MICHAEL E. GERTZMAN
 7
      SULLIVAN & CROMWELL, LLP
 8
           Attorneys for Barclays Defendants
           MATTHEW A. SCHWARTZ
     BY:
 9
           DAVID H. BRAFF
           MATTHEW A. PELLER
10
           JACOB B. LIEBERMAN
11
      ALLEN & OVERY, LLP
           Attorneys for Defendants BNP Paribas Group, et al.
12
      BY:
           ANDREW R. DAVIES
           REBECCA R. DELFINER
13
           DAVID C. ESSEKS
           LAURA R. HALL
14
      COVINGTON & BURLING, L.L.P.
15
           Attorneys for Defendants Citigroup Inc., et al.
          ANDREW A. RUFFINO
      BY:
           ANDREW D. LAZEROW
16
           ALAN M. WISEMAN
17
      CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP
18
           Attorneys for Credit Suisse Defendants
      BY:
           HERBERT S. WASHER
19
           MARGARET A. BARONE
           JASON M. HALL
20
           DAVID G. JANUSZEWSKI
           ELAI E. KATZ
21
      KING & SPALDING LLP (DC)
22
           Attorneys for Defendants Deutsche Bank AG,
           Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.
23
      BY: GEORGE P. MONTGOMERY
           JOSEPH SERINO, JR.
24
           ERIC F. LEON
25
```

```
1
      CLEARY GOTTLIEB
           Attorneys for Defendants Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., et al.
 2
           THOMAS J. MOLONEY
      BY:
           RISHI N. ZUTSHI
 3
      LOCKE LORD LLP
 4
           Attorneys for Defendants HSBC HOLDINGS PLC, et al.
           JAMES M. GOODIN
 5
           ROGER B. COWIE
           GREGORY T. CASAMENTO
           JULIA C. WEBB
 6
 7
      SKADDEN, ARPS
           Attorneys for Defendants JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al.
 8
      BY:
           PETER E. GREENE
           BORIS BERSHTEYN
9
           JOHN COGHLAN
           TANSY WOAN
10
           HARRY P. KOULOS
           GRETCHEN WOLF
11
      DONTZIN NAGY & FLEISSIG LLP
12
          Attorneys for Defendants JPMorgan Chase, et al.
           TIBOR L. NAGY, JR.
      BY:
13
      WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ
           Attorneys for Defendants Morgan Stanley, et al.
14
      BY:
           JONATHAN M. MOSES
15
           JUSTIN L. BROOKE
16
      MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC
           Attorneys for Defendants RBC Capital Markets LLC, et al.
           JAMES P. McLOUGHLIN, JR.
17
      BY:
           MARK A. NEBRIG
           JOSHUA D. LANNING
18
19
      DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP (NYC)
           Attorneys for Defendants Royal Bank of Scotland, et al.
20
      BY:
           PAUL S. MISHKIN
           JOEL M. COHEN
21
           ADAM G. MEHES
           MAUDE PAQUIN
22
           ALYSSA B. GOMEZ
23
      HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
           Attorneys for Defendant Standard Chartered Bank
24
      BY:
           MARC J. GOTTRIDGE
           LISA J. FRIED
25
           CHARLES B. MOORE
           BENJAMIN A. FLEMING
```

```
KBJZZCONHRT
      GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
 1
           Attorneys for Defendants UBS AG, et al.
 2
           ERIC J. STOCK
      BY:
           DAVID J. ARP
 3
           MELANIE L. KATSUR
           AMY FEAGLES
 4
           PHILIP O. SHAPIRO
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE DEPUTY CLERK: James Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corporation, et al., Docket 17-CV-3139. We are here before the Honorable Lorna G. Schofield.

I want to remind the parties and the press that recording or rebroadcasting of this proceeding is prohibited. Violation of this prohibition may result in sanctions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're here for a final fairness hearing for approval of settlement in one of the so-called Forex cases, and this one involving plaintiffs who indirectly purchased foreign exchange instruments from the defendant.

I have your papers. I know we're here on a variety of motions — the motion for final approval of the settlement and related approval, as well as the fee application and application for a service fee for the named plaintiffs.

And so as you all know, just from having participated in the preliminary fairness hearing, that is the time when I really scrutinized the settlement, because there is no point, I think, in sending a notice out for settlement that is not going to be approved. So I have done that, and then that applied for the most part.

If Mr. Dell'Angelo would like to make a brief statement about the settlement, and particularly about the lack of opt-out objections and the notice and etc., I'll be happy to hear that.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Thank you, your Honor. I appreciate that. I will say that I am pleased to say I think I what you are suggesting is exactly what I was going to propose to the Court as a structure to keep this discussion efficient in light of what Rule 23 requires for preliminary approval. I will be brief. And then to the extent you have questions or would like us to address any part of the motion, of course, we're more than happy to do so.

So, of course, we are again pleased to present for final approval five settlements, totaling \$23.63 million, that will fully and finally resolve the litigation.

When your Honor examined the settlements at the preliminary approval stage, we outlined — and I think there was some discussion and of course consideration in your Honor's order of the various Grinnell factors, one of which neither the parties nor the Court had information about at the time was the reaction of the classes to the settlement. In order to frame that, I would like to take a moment to address the notice plan.

Pursuant to your Honor's order, we utilized Heffler Claims Group to disseminate notice. Initially Heffler Claims Group had projected that the notice program would reach between 80 and 86 percent of the settlement class. We're very pleased to report that largely, in light of our efforts to gather data, RFEDs, retail foreign exchange dealers, with whom the absent class members and class members transacted, we obtained e-mail

addresses and typical mail addresses that enabled the notice program to, based on the claim administrator's estimates, reach approximately 95 percent of the settlement class. And what's more, the structure of the settlement, the notice program enabled us to reach each class member approximately 3.9 times, based on the estimates of the claims administrator.

We did so by mailing 94,876 postcard notices on August 12. A percentage of those, about 16,000, came back as undeliverable. The claims administrator then did considerable effort in terms of skip tracing and researching at those addresses, and remailed close to 14,000 of them. And only about 890 came back as undeliverable.

At the same time, the claims administrator on August 12, 2020, e-mailed 43,309 notices to absent class members. And a very small fraction of those, 2,450, bounced back as undeliverable. And just to reaffirm, we engaged the claims administrator to send a reminder on October 27, which had no undeliverables as a result of weeding out the first set of undeliverables.

The mail and e-mail notice that we effected with the addresses that we obtained through the RFEDs was reinforced in a number of ways, through a publication notice and Internet advertising notice.

On August 10 a press release issued that was targeted to 1,770 influencers who cover finance. That press release

picked up in the news and received almost 100 mentions.

Then separately, all of that work was bolstered with banner ads, Google search ads, and social media ads on Facebook and Instagram that were targeted both from the eight states where the plaintiffs and the absent class members reside, and which covers scope of the settlement.

And then further focused on financial institutions and other financial advertising and news outlets such as The Wall Street Journal, Seeking Alpha, Morningstar, etc.

And all of that was then backed up with a settlement website that has been active since August 8, 2020. That alone has had over 15,000 page views and is backed by a 24-hour toll-free line and a dedicated post office address.

As a result of those efforts, having reached at least 95 percent of the settlement class members directly, and then through various publication notice, we're extremely pleased to report not a single class member has objected or opted out of the settlement. And as Judge Rakoff has recently found in the GSE Bonds Antitrust Litigation case, a favorable reception from the class constitutes strong evidence that proposed settlement is fair.

And I'd like to emphasize, because all defendants have settled, and not a single absent class member has objected or opted out, this will in fact affirm legal fees for the defendants and achieve exactly what the parties were trying to

achieve, and is an indication that the class members found the settlement to be fair, reasonable and adequate. And an indication as well that none believe that they could do better than we were able to do for them as part of the settlement.

Unless your Honor has specific questions about that process or anything else in our submission, I would rely on our filing.

I guess just making one additional note to be abundantly clear for the record, sometimes in these cases class counsel will receive a comment or a criticism by e-mail or voicemail from class members, positive or negative. We have not received -- and those don't constitute a valid opt-out/objection. Even post the October 15 opt-out/objection deadline, we haven't even received a single word of criticism from that.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. I'm not sure if I've ever seen where there is not a single objection or opt-out. So congratulations on that. I don't have any other questions about the settlement itself.

I have one request, and that is that you e-mail my chambers the proposed order in Word format.

I did want to turn to your other motion, which is application for fees and expenses as well as service fees. I would just note -- I will confess, I didn't look at the caption on the proposed order. I just started reading it. And I was

fairly alarmed. And when I did finally look at the caption, you had attached the wrong proposed order. So a lot of questions that I was going to ask, I won't ask.

But I will ask for a new proposed order for this case for the fee application and service fee. I had a few questions in that regard.

For the fee application, how will it be allocated among the plaintiffs' firms?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: First, thank you. Your Honor, let me apologize for the inadvertent error in the proposed order. I think as we indicated in your Honor's form pursuant to Individual Rule III.C.5, the fees will be allocated to class counsel on a straight lodestar basis. Meaning, there is no sort of differentiation between what multiple counsel may receive or the like. The understanding among --

THE COURT: Just so I have it, so it's pro rata based on lodestar; is that right?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: That's correct. With the understanding that the fee award, at least as requested, represents a negative lodestar of about .94. But, yes, it would be pro rata.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I presume, but I want confirmation, that there is no other fee sharing?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Well, there is. As we indicated in your Honor's form III.C.5, there is one referral agreement. I

think your Honor has a fee sharing disclosure requirement and --

THE COURT: I didn't find that in your papers.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: Do you have a docket number of that particular piece of paper?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Sure, let me take a look at it. I have to confess, this version does not have the docket number on it. While I'm trying to identify the docket number, maybe Mr. Ripley or Mr. Kane have it handy and they can identify it for us.

What that disclosure provides, your Honor, is that the Kehoe Law Firm, who represents FXPRIMUS, a Florida-based plaintiff in the case, that the agreement among counsel is that the Kehoe firm would receive 10 percent of the attorney's fees that were attributable to the settlement amounts that went to Florida plaintiffs.

So the idea being, if Florida plaintiffs made claims in the amount of whatever percentage they would be, if they have 10 percent of the total, we would take that 10 percent and say, in effect, 10 percent of the attorney's fees were attributable to Florida, and the Kehoe firm would receive 10 percent of those fees.

The disclosure itself appears at docket 419-1, page eight of nine. That's the first place that I spotted. I think

we submitted it a few times, your Honor. That was attached to plaintiff's memorandum in support of plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval.

THE COURT: Okay. What else is there? It sounds like there are nine pages in this document. What else is disclosed in the document?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: That particular document is the full submission pursuant to your Honor's individual practice, or Individual Rule III.C.5. That just provides a brief introduction of the settlements, a discussion of the total settlement fund, the claims administration fees, cost and expenses. Just on the ninth page — sorry. And the last page, your Honor, has subpart VIII as what Rule III.C.5 requires, the summary of information. And the summary of information, your Honor, has the table that asks for the settlement amount, the estimated notice of administration costs, expert fees, anticipated fee, etc.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: So the last is that rule, disclosure, it begins on page seven of nine.

THE COURT: So my question is, maybe can I ask my law clerk, who I know is on the phone, if she can send me that --

MR. DELL'ANGELO: I'm sorry to interrupt.

THE COURT: That's okay. You found the other one at?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Docket 420, discussed in paragraph

33.

THE COURT: So my question is, is there anything else about fees and where the fees are going? I understand that there is one referral agreement, as you described it, and I understand the allocation of plaintiff's firm. Is there any other arrangement with respect to fee?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: None whatsoever, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And nothing has been paid to any putative objectors; is that right?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Nothing. And, again, just to be clear, we haven't even heard from them. I haven't heard from an objector. Nothing has been paid to anybody or promised or even discussed; haven't heard from any.

THE COURT: Could you tell me what the settlement agreement says about the timing of the payment of fees and expenses, as provided in the settlement agreement. Remind me what that says.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: It becomes effective after the order on fees becomes final. So we interpret that to be 30-plus-one days after the order is issued, provided that there is not an appeal.

THE COURT: Okay. What is the timing of the payment of the claim?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: The plan of allocation, the order on the plan of allocation has a schedule built into it.

THE COURT: The reason I ask, while you're flipping to it, I know there are good arguments for getting class counsel paid sooner than later, primarily that you've been litigating this case since 2017 and you haven't been paid anything, and that there is considerable risk during that time of what would be paid; I suppose, theoretically, there still is. It also seems a bit unseemly to me to write quite a large check to class counsel, at the same time that the claimants and class members aren't being paid. And particularly when there is a long period of time between the final approval of the settlement and the actual payment of class members.

And so that's what I'm trying to get out. I'm trying to figure out when people will likely get paid. Because it affects my consideration of when class counsel will be paid.

Hello?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm glad I didn't lose you.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: I was trying to be sensitive to background noise, and was muted.

The claims deadline is within 120 days after final approval is granted. So the date to get in those claims will depend a little bit on when it is your Honor enters final approval. That's the claim form, just to be clear, to get the claim form in to the claims administrator.

Because we have fairly detailed data from all the

RFEDs as a result of the subpoena that we went through, I anticipate the claims process can be handled pretty efficiently because we already have the data to cross-check information that the plaintiffs submit.

But there is not a date certain, as is generally the case in these settlements, when checks would actually be cut. We need to get the claims in and process it.

THE COURT: Could you check with the claims

administrator and get an estimate of how long it takes to pay

the claims after the claims deadline. And put that in a letter

and file the letter. And the sooner you file the letter, the

sooner I can act on the fee application.

I know there are separate orders. I can certainly act on the final approval of the settlement — which there is no mystery, I am approving — I can act on that quickly. And then I can act on the fee application once I understand when plaintiffs will be paid or an estimate of when they will be paid.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Of course, your Honor, I'll be happy to do that.

THE COURT: Okay. I won't set a deadline. It's in your interest to get that to me sooner than later. I'll look it at when I get it.

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Understood.

THE COURT: With respect to the service fees for the

class representatives, I understand you're seeking \$5,000 for class representatives, which is reasonable and it's consistent and in line with what I have ordered in other cases. I won't be having any trouble with that either. The reason I was a little bit alarmed, in the proposed order you had given me the proposed payment to each of the class representatives of \$40,000. I didn't even know that courts did that, but perhaps in other kinds of cases they do.

So in any event, it seems like everything is in order in terms of the substance. I'll await the filing of the letter from you, then I'll act on it.

Is there anything else we need to address?

MR. DELL'ANGELO: Not from my perspective. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. I have nothing else either. We are adjourned.

17 000